



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,805	08/04/2004	Melanie S. Campbell	27475/06963	4804

24024 7590 04/21/2006

CALFEE HALTER & GRISWOLD, LLP
800 SUPERIOR AVENUE
SUITE 1400
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

ABRAMOWITZ, HOWARD E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

.1762

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Ca

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/710,805</p>	<p>Applicant(s) CAMPBELL ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner Howard E. Abramowitz</p>	<p>Art Unit 1762</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
- NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection over Schlegel of claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 53 and 56.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: _____.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☒ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see response to arguments.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/11/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant has argued in an affidavit that the references teach coating two-dimensional substrates and not three-dimensional substrates and goes on to give an art excepted definition of each term.

The examiner argues that the claims are not limited to the coating industry and are open to any field of endeavor. It is generally accepted that articles have three dimensions not two dimensions whether they are flat or otherwise shaped.

Alternatively, specific fields in the coating industry define three dimensional differently, for example, the imperfections in a flat "two-dimensional" piece of wood would be considered large trenches in the microelectronics coating industry, and in those coating applications would meet the applicants definition of three dimensional. Accordingly the term three-dimensional in the claims is not limited to what the applicant intends three-dimensional to imply but rather the general accepted meaning of the term.

The applicant has argued that Blazey and Nielsen teach coating two-dimensional substrates not three dimensional substrates.

The examiner still submits that all substrates are inherently three-dimensional not two-dimensional as the applicant claims.

The applicant has argued that Hasenour does not teach every element of the rejected claims as it does not explicitly teach a thickness in the claimed range. Arguing

Art Unit: 1762

that although Hasenour wants to remove the plastic look of the film doing so would not inherently place the film in the desired thickness of the applicant's invention.

The examiner argues that the method of Hasenour is designed to run the substrate through the coating apparatus at a faster rate than could be accomplished previously in order to prevent plastic looking films (paragraph 37). The applicant admits that plastic looking films occur when the thickness is in the range of 2-4 mils.

Accordingly decreasing the amount of time spent coating the film would decrease the thickness of the film and therefore the films inherently would be deposited in thickness of less than 2 mils thus falling within the claimed range.

Applicant's arguments, see remarks pages 14 and 15, filed 4/11/06, with respect to claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 53 and 56 as rejected by Schlegel have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of these claims has been withdrawn.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Howard E. Abramowitz whose telephone number is 571-272-8557. The examiner can normally be reached on monday-friday 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HEA
HEA


TIMOTHY MEEKS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER